

GEN. LIBRARY
APR-7 1913
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VI

NEW YORK, APRIL 5, 1913

No. 21

In the January number of *The Classical Journal*, Professor B. O. Foster, of Leland Stanford University, has a paper entitled *Live Latin*, which deals with the new movement in Latin teaching. This paper had been read at the meeting of The Classical Association of Northern California on July 11, 1911. This was a year before Dr. Rouse came to this country. Consequently Professor Foster does not cite the recent literature. The paper is a plea for direct teaching, as that term is now understood. Professor Foster shows himself firmly convinced of the value of the Direct Method, which he defends vigorously against the objections of American teachers who maintain that it is not practicable for American conditions. He admits that he would hesitate to meet an advanced class that has received its earlier training after the oral method, but he is sure that, if given a chance to teach beginners in this way, he could go on until "by the time these youngsters had risen to the university (he) should (himself) have attained a very respectable fluency in speaking Latin". Meantime he maintains that there are a number of things that every teacher can do if he wants to, and ought to do. These are

1. To devote at least half the hour in the first-year class to oral drill with books closed.
2. To have all Latin—both prose and verse—read aloud in class, whether or no it is all to be translated.
3. To ask occasional questions in Latin and require answers in the same language.
4. To tell the children little stories from time to time, and require repetitions of them, both oral, and (later) written.
5. To make the pupils read aloud to their fellows, each in his turn, from some simple book well within their grasp—say for second- and third-year classes such an easy reader as Sonnenschein's *Ora Maritima*, or Kirtland's *Fabulae Faciles*.
6. To require from time to time memorizing of choice excerpts.

Professor Foster continues as follows:

I should confidently predict for classes where these things had been done (1) that *word-order*, that *terra incognita* to the average college student, would be very fairly understood and appreciated; (2) that forms and constructions would be much more quickly recognized than is usually the case now; (3) that the vocabulary—from the large amount of practice in *using* the words, without dictionaries or other helps—would be well mastered, and (4) that, as a result of these other improvements, but most of all of

the ability to follow Latin word-order, the *reading of Latin would be robbed of all its terrors*.

I am inclined to think that Professor Foster has a rather roseate dream of what is likely to happen if the oral method is followed, or even if his suggestions are put into practice. In the first place many teachers will find it extremely difficult so to arrange their work that they will have adequate time for the six details. Then, too, we have not yet got to the point when we frankly recognize that language work is not for every mind, and hence there will be not a few minds in the Latin classes which will not respond greatly to this new kind of stimulus. I have my doubts about ever making Latin an easy or even reasonably easy subject. So I am not so sure that the reading of Latin will be robbed of all its terrors. But one does not have to have such roseate hopes to recognize that, if Professor Foster's suggestions are intelligently followed out so far as they can be, the results will certainly be better than they are.

The Report of the Second Meeting of the School for the Reform of Latin Teaching in England has just come to hand. The work was much the same as in the first session (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.33). So were the enthusiasm and the numbers. The report has as a kind of appendix a criticism by Professor Arnold, in which he says some things that have occurred to some of us. Adhesion to the principle involved in the new method does not necessarily involve acceptance of the particular practices adopted by Dr. Rouse or any other well known user of it. In fact, one of the remarkable things connected with this movement in England is the willingness of its advocates to merge their own individual preferences in their feeling that the movement does promise something of value for the saving of a study which some of its advocates, such as Mr. Benson, have about come to believe can hardly be saved at all, if the present results are to be accepted as all that can be expected in the teaching of the future. One point mentioned by Professor Arnold will answer a criticism that I have often heard brought against the use of Latin for every day concerns:

It was remarkable how entirely the fear that "reformed methods" encouraged "dog Latin" had vanished. The fact was simply that "dog Latin" was not

heard. The teachers of the classes did not use it; Mr. W. H. S. Jones's picture-stories showed on the contrary that style can be taught orally at a stage where pupils under the old methods were still translating English sentences to illustrate syntax rules in which the difference between Roman Latin and "dog Latin" has no existence. G. L.

DID TACITUS IN THE ANNALS TRADUCE THE CHARACTER OF TIBERIUS?

It has been the practice in some quarters in recent years to criticise Tacitus's portraiture of Tiberius and to charge the historian with a wilful distortion of the facts of history. It has been asserted that Tacitus vilified and maligned Tiberius in the portrait of that Emperor handed down to us in the Annals. The champions of Tiberius charge that the famous Roman historian painted the Emperor in much darker colors than the facts of history warranted. Several erudite pamphlets and volumes have been written during the last half century by the defenders of Tiberius, the burden of whose argument has been to impeach the evidence of Tacitus and to discredit him generally as the historian of the early Empire, in the attempt to rehabilitate the character of Tiberius. Holding a brief for the unhappy Emperor, his champions have endeavored to bleach out the black, hideous spots in his traditional character and to make him appear 'a man more sinned against than sinning'.

It may prove interesting to inquire in some detail if the severe judgment Tacitus passed upon Tiberius is warranted by the facts of history. It is the purpose of the present paper therefore to review briefly the case for Tacitus and to determine, so far as we may, whether the historian is justly worthy of all the censure and disparagement heaped upon him in recent times for his alleged traduction of Tiberius's character.

Since the days of Voltaire, who in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique* set the precedent, a few scholars in various lands have ventured to challenge the veracity of Tacitus, in defence of Tiberius. Among those who have tilted against Tacitus and broken a lance in behalf of Tiberius one may mention Voltaire, Linguet, Napoleon and Bacha in France; Buchholz, Krueger, Sievers, Stahr and Freytag in Germany; Ihne, Merivale, Beesly, Baring Gould and Tarver in England; Ferrero in Italy; and Huidekoper and Jerome in America (this list includes the chief representative scholars who have written upon this question). In his excellent edition of the *Annals* Furneaux makes some strictures upon Tacitus, but does not flay him or try utterly to discredit his record.

In the present paper it will not be convenient, for obvious reasons, to discuss in detail the arguments of each of the disparagers of Tacitus. Let it suffice to select one or two as representative of the class and

to give the principal points in their discussions.

The defenders of Tiberius, in general, have subjected the record of Tacitus to a searching examination and have not been content merely to undertake to impeach his veracity, but have also contended that his record teems with grossly wilful and malicious misrepresentation. Some allege that, actuated by bitter prejudice toward Tiberius, Tacitus did not scruple to distort the facts in a flagrant manner and habitually to falsify history. Others hold that Tacitus was no historian, but a bitter pamphleteer of consummate ability. Still others maintain that Tacitus was a trained rhetorician who did not scruple to falsify history in order to write fine, brilliant rhetoric.

The older champions of Tiberius, such as Stahr and Freytag in Germany, in their respective volumes drew up against Tacitus a formidable indictment with many separate counts. The more recent champions have fully maintained the traditions set by their predecessors in recourse to the *argumentum ad hominem*, rehabilitating Tiberius by excoriating Tacitus. Bacha, in his recent book *Le Genie de Tacite, La Creation des Annales*, affirms that the *Annals* are simply a work of romance, not history, and that Tacitus, though an artist, is an artist biased by prejudice, who turns his skill to traducing the facts of history. Tarver, in his portly volume, *Tiberius the Tyrant*, makes no less savage an attack upon Tacitus, branding him a bitter pamphleteer whose affectation of impartiality is a well-considered pose and whose insincerity becomes manifest as soon as we study the effect produced by his writing upon the minds of his readers. Jerome, in his clever article, *The Tacitean Tiberius* (*Classical Philology* 7.265-292), contends that Tacitus was a rhetorician by instinct and training whose ruling passion was to use beautiful language effectively and that Tacitus did not scruple to falsify history in order to portray Tiberius as the typical tyrant. Jerome's argument implies that Tacitus is not only absolutely untrustworthy as a historian, but that he is a notorious literary impostor because he published as true history a brilliant piece of rhetoric written in utter disregard of the facts of the life of Tiberius. The purport of Jerome's article therefore is thoroughly to discredit Tacitus's record and to destroy all confidence in this famous Roman historian as a moral writer.

Having thus briefly set forth the grave indictment drawn against Tacitus by the modern defenders of Tiberius, we should now inquire into the credibility of Tacitus's judgment upon Tiberius and endeavor to determine if the Romans themselves, who were better acquainted both with the historian and the Emperor than we are, ever made any systematic attack upon Tacitus's trustworthiness as the historian of the Roman Empire.

It must be admitted at the outset that the judgment

Tacitus passes upon Tiberius is vigorous and drastic. But it is a moot question whether the portraiture of Tiberius which is preserved to us in the *Annals* is in darker colors than the facts of history warrant. For our knowledge of Tiberius we are indebted primarily to Tacitus. But there are other ancient writers, also, who attempted a portrayal of that unhappy Roman Emperor. Let us then compare the Tiberius of those writers with the Tacitean Tiberius and see for ourselves whether Tacitus, as alleged, so basely and shamelessly exaggerated and traduced the facts of history.

The two historians regarded as the most important next after Tacitus for this period of Roman history are Suetonius and Dio Cassius. Of these Suetonius, who as Hadrian's secretary was surely in a position, in writing his life of Tiberius, to have access to all the trustworthy documents, differs in some details from the record of Tacitus; yet Suetonius's judgment, in all essential points, confirms Tacitus's estimate and is indeed even more severe and damaging. It may be admitted, however, that Suetonius is rather garrulous and anecdotal; nevertheless his testimony should not, for this reason, be rejected, but is entitled to be accepted as evidence. Dio Cassius, who wrote a more voluminous history of the Caesars than Suetonius, was by birth a Greek and can not therefore be said to have inherited a prejudice against the Roman Emperors, such as Tacitus is alleged to have entertained; furthermore, Dio Cassius had no reason to be hostile to the Caesars. Yet Dio Cassius writes as scathing an indictment against Tiberius as Tacitus does and is in substantial agreement with this Roman historian. Dio's history represents Tiberius as a cold, stern, cruel and distrustful prince. As Boissier observes in his Tacitus (page 99), it is impossible to obtain anything from Dio's work which could serve to whitewash Tiberius.

Of the two Jewish writers, Philo Judaeus and Josephus, the former surveyed Tiberius only from Palestine, and his record is not unfavorable. But Josephus, who during his long residence at Rome naturally enjoyed better opportunity to study Tiberius's character, gives quite an unfavorable estimate which tends to confirm Tacitus's verdict. Juvenal, Seneca and the elder Pliny¹, in their incidental notices of Tiberius, furnish very little evidence, but even this little is not in conflict with Tacitus. It follows, then, that Tacitus must have accepted the established tradition in his estimate of Tiberius.

One Roman writer, however, remains to be mentioned whose testimony is strikingly at variance with Tacitus's estimate of Tiberius, and that is Velleius Paterculus. But Velleius Paterculus's championship of the Emperor is generally explained on the score of his personal relations; for he served many years

under Tiberius and was included in the first list of the Emperor's praetors. Moreover, Velleius's sketch does not cover the latter part of Tiberius's life when he played the rôle of the tyrant, and is so full of rhetorical exaggeration that it is hardly to be admitted as evidence. It is of a piece with the fulsome flattery of Domitian contained in the poems of Martial and Statius. Velleius's panegyric, which covers only the first sixteen years of Tiberius's principate, is quite as eloquent, as Furneaux suggests, by its significant omissions as the studied epigrams of Tacitus. For Velleius passes over in sphinx-like silence the period of Tiberius's permanent retirement from Rome; and, too, the cruel orders Tiberius issued from his island fortress of Capri are wanting, of course, in this incomplete record left by his lieutenant. It is also worthy of note as indicating the attitude of Velleius that he eulogises Sejanus quite as highly as he does that minister's Emperor. Yet, surely, few even of those who would bleach out the black spots in Tiberius's traditional character are prepared to whitewash his infamous minister.

It follows, therefore, that Velleius Paterculus's testimony must be discounted as a mere panegyric, obviously too fulsome to be credited. His sketch must have been intended as an extravagant tribute to his superior officer upon the occasion of the latter's elevation to the purple. It is manifestly unfair to allow any such laudatory account, which is the only one by a Roman writer strikingly at variance with Tacitus, to outweigh as evidence the traditional estimate of Tiberius preserved to us in the *Annals*. For Tacitus's portraiture of Tiberius, as has been shown, is, in the main, the established tradition, confirmed by almost universal verdict of antiquity. History furnishes indisputable evidence that Tiberius, before his appointment to the principate, was very unpopular with his contemporaries, including even Augustus, that the legions mutinied when he assumed the purple, and that he has found but few champions among subsequent generations of the Roman people (see Ferrero, *Greatness and Decline of Rome*, Volume 5).

Since Tacitus's veracity has been called into question by the modern defenders of Tiberius, it is important to determine how the historian was regarded by his contemporaries. There is certainly no warrant in antiquity for the effort to depreciate and discredit Tacitus. On the contrary, he was held in the highest esteem. Pliny the younger, who knew him intimately, cheerfully testifies in his letters to the great respect and admiration in which his contemporaries held the historian. In *Epp.* 7.20 Pliny speaks of the distinction and renown Tacitus had attained even when Pliny himself was but a young man. Tacitus, who was perhaps not much more than eight years older than Pliny, must therefore have won an established reputation early in life. Again Pliny (7.33) testifies to Tacitus's merit as a historian and says, 'I know

¹ Compare Juvenal 10.75; Seneca *De Ben.* 3.26.1; Pliny, *N. H.* 14.28.

that your histories will be immortal and this makes me the more anxious that my name should appear in them'. Furthermore, it is an eloquent, though mute, tribute to the confidence Tacitus enjoyed that he was promoted to exalted posts of honor under the three successive Flavian Emperors, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian.

Inasmuch as a manifestly false and inadequate conception of history has been attributed to Tacitus by his detractors, an appeal to his own works is imperative in order to ascertain his real conception of history and his sources of information. He sets forth his cherished conception of history in the following words (Annals 3.65.1): 'I believe the chief function of history to be to hold up virtue to admiration and to brand base words and deeds to posthumous infamy'. Surely this implies on Tacitus's part a seriousness of purpose, a candor and a sense of justice which it is impossible to reconcile with his alleged wilful and malicious perversion of facts. "The key to the interpretation of Tacitus", says Dill (Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius 26), "is to regard him as a moralist rather than a politician". Tacitus unquestionably wrote with a high moral purpose and, no doubt, felt himself under obligation to ascertain the truth and to tell it without fear or favor. This is manifest in his writings. Assuredly in his profession as a historian, then, there is no warrant for branding him a literary impostor.

Tacitus does not, as a rule, give his chief sources of information. In Annals I-VI he mentions only two specific authorities, the elder Pliny's history of the German wars (Ann. 1.69.3) and the memoirs of the younger Agrippina (Ann. 4.53.3). However, it is to be noted, as Furneaux observes, that Tacitus mentions these documents in such a way as to indicate that he is drawing his information from a less usual source overlooked by those whom he generally follows. The loss of Pliny's history precludes the possibility of determining Tacitus's indebtedness to this authority. As for the memoirs of Agrippina, upon which the defenders of Tiberius lay so much stress, it is important to observe that Tacitus's indebtedness to this lost document is largely a matter of surmise and reposes on very slight evidence.

Most of Tacitus's references to his authorities for the Annals are quite indefinite, being such as *scriptores* (2.88.1), *scriptores annalium* (4.53.3), *temporis eius auctores* (5.9.3), *quidam tradidere* (1.13.3; 1.53.9; 2.17.7; etc.), *ferunt* (3.73.2), *tradunt plerique* . . . *alii* (1.29.4), etc. In the later books of the Annals the author cites some special authorities, as Pliny (13.20.3), Cluvius Rufus (13.20.3), Fabius Rusticus (13.20.2), Domitius Corbulo (15.16.1). In the absence of positive evidence we may assume that Tacitus's general references include the following authorities: (1) Aufidius Bassus, who wrote a gen-

eral history as well as a history of the German wars (cf. Quintilian 10.1.102-103), Servilius Nonianus (ibid.), the elder Seneca, whose history covered the period from the civil wars to the end of Tiberius's reign; (2) the autobiographies of the early Caesars—Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, etc.; (3) the biographies of Thrasea and Helvidius by Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio, etc.; (4) funeral orations of distinguished Romans. Moreover, being a man of high social position, Tacitus naturally had access to the most reliable sources of information through conversation with the most eminent of his contemporaries. Among the state documents he probably consulted may be mentioned (1) the *acta senatus*, a record of the proceedings of the senate; (2) the *acta populi* or *acta diurna*, a kind of court journal like the modern newspaper; (3) the *commentarii principum*, the private journal of the *princeps*; (4) the public inscriptions, whose name was legion.

So much for Tacitus's sources. At the conclusion of the sixth book of the Annals (chapter 51) the author gives a résumé of his estimate of Tiberius, dividing the Emperor's career into six periods. After speaking of the perils that beset Tiberius's early life and his unfortunate marriage to the notorious Julia and his adoption into the imperial family, Tacitus continues: 'For twenty-three years he held absolute sway over the Roman Empire. During this time his manners varied with the condition of his fortune. His conduct and reputation were exemplary as long as he was a private citizen or occupied posts of honor under Augustus. He was reserved and deceitful, assuming certain virtues, while Drusus and Germanicus were alive. He exhibited a mixture of good and evil qualities while his mother lived. His cruelty was infamous, but he covered up the evidence of his licentiousness as long as he loved or feared Sejanus. At last he broke forth into acts of disgraceful and heinous wickedness when, upon the removal of the restraints of shame and fear, he followed the bent of his own disposition'.

Such is Tacitus's famous judgment upon Tiberius's character. According to the historian's own statement, Tiberius's conduct up to the time of his accession, i.e. to his fifty-sixth year, was above reproach. This point is emphasized by Tiberius's champions, especially by Beesly, who clinches his argument with the statement, "I would put it to you, Have you in your own experience found that men come out in an entirely new character after fifty-six?" But this argument is not conclusive. For, while in ordinary circumstances it may be true that a man's character is established by fifty-six so that it is unlikely to undergo any radical change for the worse, still in exceptional circumstances such as those of Tiberius, upon his assuming the purple with all which that imported, it is not at all beyond the range

of possibility for a man's character to change for the worse even after he has reached three score years and for him to allow his evil tendencies, which he may have kept under control successfully up to that critical period in his life, to gain the mastery over him and materially to alter and mar his declining years. Apart from personal unpopularity Tiberius had his infamous minister Sejanus to thank in large measure for the disrepute and obloquy attaching to his reign. The Emperor himself is generally believed to have earnestly striven to do his duty to the Empire during the early part of his principate. He made it his guiding principle to maintain with scrupulous reverence the constitutional forms established by Augustus and was almost punctilious in his observance of the traditional privileges and rights of the senate. He established only two radical departures that proved a menace to the palladium of civil liberty—the permanent encampment of the praetorian guard next to the walls of Rome and the complete abolition of the old comitia. For the former of these ominous innovations Sejanus was, no doubt, responsible. Tiberius also permitted Sejanus to exercise other forms of tyranny in his political prosecutions and executions, and thus by silent compliance more than by overt act contributed to make his principate odious in the memory of the Roman people, especially through the iniquitous treason trials and 'delations'.

Tacitus affirms that Tiberius was reserved and deceitful, assuming certain virtues while Drusus and Germanicus were alive. This implies that Tiberius practised hypocrisy and this is the traditional view. From the nature of the case this count in the indictment does not admit of ready proof. However, it must be admitted that Tiberius's conduct toward the family of Germanicus, especially after the death of Germanicus, savored of relentless persecution and cruelty, whatever may have been his attitude toward Germanicus personally. Nor does it exonerate Tiberius to assert that Sejanus was responsible for the fatal punishment meted out to Agrippina and her son. For, as a certain scholar has epigrammatically expressed it, what an absolute ruler permits through his minister he performs in fact. Granted that the first eight years of Tiberius's principate were marked by a generally just and mild government, the evidence nevertheless goes to show that from the death of Drusus in the year 23 A.D. the Emperor's character underwent a gradual change for the worse. If any definite evidence of this is demanded, perhaps there should be cited first of all the obnoxious growth of 'delations' and the abominable treason trials which, it must be admitted, Tiberius extended with all too ready application. It is true that there were laws applicable to such cases on the statute-book. But these laws had lain dormant for years, till Tiberius revived them and enforced them

with an unwonted scrupulousness and rigor, extending them far beyond any precedent set by Augustus. It was the rigorous execution of the treason laws with their ever-fostering growth of 'delations' which more than any other feature served to bring Tiberius's reign into ill-repute and abhorrence both with the Roman nobility and the populace. Whatever may be urged in extenuation of this flagrant abuse under Tiberius, it can not be denied that the result was the upgrowth of an abundant crop of accusers who by their nefarious practice struck alarm and terror into the hearts of all good citizens. For, according to the maxim of Domitian, who alone surpassed Tiberius in this respect, 'the prince who does not check accusers stimulates them' (Suetonius, Dom. 9).

The remaining divisions of Tacitus's summary of Tiberius's principate, from the exigencies of space, may be briefly discussed together. The Emperor's task was rendered somewhat more difficult through the influence of his ambitious mother, who was constantly striving to seize the reins of government. As for Sejanus, little can be said of his defence after he became intoxicated with the love of power. Except Stahr (see his *Tiberius*, Chapter 11) the champions of Tiberius have not attempted to rehabilitate his minister. For Sejanus's black villainy and heinous crimes are universally regarded as inaugurating a veritable reign of terror at Rome after Tiberius's withdrawal from the city. Indeed, it was through Sejanus's influence that Tiberius permanently retired from Rome and took up his residence at Capri. When at length the Emperor's eyes were opened to the enormities of Sejanus's iniquitous conduct, not the least villainous of which was his conspiracy to seize the supreme power, Tiberius put aside his characteristic irresolution and issued orders from his island fortress for the speedy execution of that monster. In regard to Tiberius's life of open shame and infamy at Capri it is worthy of note that Tacitus, true moralist that he was, does not spend much time in delineating such acts of monstrous depravity. It is Suetonius, not Tacitus, who has handed down to us the revolting details of indecency and disgrace, the licentious orgies, which tradition has connected with Tiberius's secluded life at Capri. The defamers of Tacitus, in their championship of Tiberius, generally lose sight of this fact.

It is evident from an examination of Tacitus's narrative that he wrote with a high moral aim and endeavored to be conscientious and discriminating. If he did less than justice to Tiberius in the portrayal of his character it is hardly credible that it resulted from any deliberate and malicious intent to do the Emperor downright injustice. Tacitus probably painted Tiberius according to the conception of that ruler which the Roman world had about the beginning of the second century A.D. Merivale (see *History*, 7.343) thinks that Tacitus allowed the satirist and the moralist in him to mar the clear

vision of the historian and to warp his judgment. Boissier (Tacitus, 145) seems to incline to the same view. This may be in a measure true. Certainly this theory would explain why Tacitus sometimes, perhaps unconsciously, seems to put a sinister interpretation upon Tiberius's acts while correctly reporting the facts. In his account of the relations of Tiberius and Germanicus Tacitus's sympathies are obviously with Germanicus, as were the sympathies of the Roman people.

Tacitus seems to have recorded the facts of Tiberius's life correctly. But he probably was in error in his interpretation of Tiberius's conduct in order to reconcile his early mild government with his later tyranny. Tacitus's interpretation assumes that Tiberius's real character was revealed in his later life. This implies that the Emperor was a hypocrite in the early part of his reign, disguising his real self till about the time of his retirement from Rome, when he threw off his cloak of hypocrisy and revealed his true tyrannical nature. This seems to be the theory Tacitus adopted to reconcile the striking discrepancy between the early and latter parts of Tiberius's reign. But this theory does not commend itself to favor; it is not plausible. It is more reasonable to assume that Tiberius endeavored earnestly to be a good ruler; but, when the crisis came upon the death of his mother about the year 29 A.D. and he experienced a rapid succession of rude shocks, such as his discovery of the villainy of his trusted minister, Tiberius lost confidence in mankind and then a radical change for the worse took place in his disposition. Other shocking circumstances to unnerve him were the alleged conspiracy of Agrippina and her sons and the startling revelation of the murder of his own son Drusus by his long-trusted Sejanus in complicity with Livia. It is quite conceivable that an old man of seventy, in the circumstances—his health shattered, his confidence ruthlessly betrayed, feeling that there was no one he could rely upon and brooding over his train of misfortunes—might very readily become altogether suspicious and distrustful and give free rein to the evil tendencies of our weak human nature. To a Caesar with supreme power, by nature stern and reserved, it is not a long step from this condition to a gloomy and suspicious tyrant, such as established tradition represents Tiberius. Such was probably the fate of this ill-starred ruler.

Now this view, which is similar to that previously advanced by Allen and other defenders of Tacitus, seems more plausible and consistent with the established facts than the theory of hypocrisy, adopted by Tacitus probably to reconcile and explain the gross inconsistencies of Tiberius's reign. This interpretation, it is to be observed, does not impair the credibility of Tacitus's record of the facts of Tiberius's career, but only militates against the historian's interpretation of Tiberius's conduct. The evidence of history as confirmed by other writers of antiquity

against Tiberius is too strong for Tacitus's account to be set aside by the mere sweeping denials of those modern champions of Tiberius who by their marvelous disinfectants would render his unsavory reputation perfectly agreeable. Tacitus must therefore be acquitted of the charge of gross perversion of the facts and of wilfully maligning and vilifying Tiberius.

However, such a character as Tiberius must have made a rather feeble appeal to the sympathies of Tacitus the moralist. No doubt, here was a temptation occasionally to warp the judgment of the historian. But the chief evidence of this, as has been pointed out, is in the interpretation of the facts, not in the record of the facts. How much of this misinterpretation was due to rhetorical exaggeration it is impossible to determine. That Tacitus shared in the tendency to rhetorical exaggeration so characteristic of writers of the Silver Age is well known. But it is unreasonable to think that he would have allowed himself to become a victim of this rhetorical tendency. Certainly there is little ground to warrant Jerome's extreme view that Tacitus was above all things a rhetorician and that he did not hesitate to falsify history purposely to write brilliant rhetoric. It is impossible to reconcile this view with the accepted belief in Tacitus as a writer of high moral character. Nor does Tacitus's misinterpretation offer any sufficient reason for the conclusion that his testimony should be impeached and his record utterly discredited.

The conclusion reached in this study is that, while Tacitus may have lapsed occasionally from his high moral aim of writing history in a fair and impartial manner, chiefly through his rhetorical training and his interpretation of the facts as a moralist, he did not traduce the character of Tiberius, but portrayed it essentially as it was known to the Roman world at the time of the writing of the *Annals*. Unfortunately for Tiberius this estimate was based largely on his conduct during the latter and unhappy part of his reign and did not, apparently, give due consideration to the early and successful part of his reign.

EDWIN P. BOWEN.

RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE, Ashland, Virginia.

REVIEW

The Essentials of Greek Syntax. By Charles Christopher Mierow. Boston: Ginn and Company (1911). Pp. vii + 165. \$1.25.

The Essentials of Greek Syntax, by Charles Christopher Mierow, Instructor in Classics in Princeton University, "seeks to present in a very clear and concise way the fundamental principles of grammar, and to show their relation to each other". The book is divided into two parts. The first part consists of a table, with examples accompanying, of the uses of nouns, pronouns, prepositions, moods, noun and adjective forms of the verb, the particle *καί*, and nega-

tives. The second part consists of exercises for composition based on Xenophon's *Anabasis*, Books I-IV, Lysias (Against the Grain Dealers, For Mantitheus, For the Cripple, and Against Eratosthenes), and Plato's *Apology*. References are made in the table of constructions to Goodwin's, Hadley and Allen's, Babbitt's, and Goodell's Greek Grammars, and in the exercises to the sections of the table. There are sufficient indexes, Greek and English, containing references to sections of the table. An apparatus is thus provided for the orderly practice of composition from the beginning of Xenophon's *Anabasis* in the High School to the end of the Freshman year in College.

The terminology followed in the first part is generally that of Goodwin's Greek Grammar. Examples are brief and clear, and, if committed to memory after the excellent German manner along with rules illustrated, would greatly facilitate a student's further progress not only in Greek composition but in reading as well. Further examples are desirable under groups of verbs governing the genitive and of those governing the dative; the English names of these verbs help but little. Some explanations and terms in the table of syntax might be improved: *ὥστε* with the infinitive (§ 123) is explained, after Goodwin, as expressing "the result which the main verb *tends* to produce", but the example given, *οὕτω διατιθεῖς ἀπεπέμπετο ὥστε αὐτῷ μᾶλλον φίλους εἶναι*, is translated as expressing the result which the agent *intends* to produce, thus "He dismissed them, treating them so that they should be more friendly to him"; however, dogmatism and brevity are not easy to attain in treating of this construction. Questions introduced by *πότερον* . . . *ἢ*, and so forth, are alternative, not double. Rhetorical questions, so called (§ 169), are not necessarily rhetorical in every instance, while on the other hand any question may be rhetorical; this is a matter of rhetoric, not of grammar. A better general title for the questions illustrated is 'Questions of Appeal', and 'Deliberation' should be added to the subdivisions. A conventional definition, not very accurate, is given for the potential optative; light on this construction, as on some others concerning Greek moods, would be shed from the treatment of the Latin subjunctive in Hale and Buck's Latin Grammar. There is no real difference between the infinitives in §§ 206 and 207, nor between those in §§ 208 and 209, and *τὸ μὴ καλεῖν* in the sentence *αὐτοὺς ἐκώλυσε τὸ μὴ καλεῖν* (page 50, footnote) is not an accusative of specification; it is an accusative of effect; hence the negative. The usual explanation of the participle as supplementary in such sentences as *μὴ περιδωμεν τὴν γῆν τηρηθείσαν* (§ 219) and *τὸ σπράτευμα τρεφόμενον ἐλάνθανε* (§ 220) is convenient; it is, however, a construing of the English translation rather than of the Greek.

The exercises for composition in the second part of the book consist of separate sentences based upon

a Greek text and intended to impress points of grammar. These exercises, though perhaps rather easily deducible from the text, will be acceptable to teachers who prefer this kind of composition. Others will own a predilection for an older kind of first composition book, now fast disappearing, consisting of separate lessons made up each of grammar references, examples, a vocabulary to be committed to memory, Greek sentences to be construed, translated and explained, and English sentences of an independent sort to be translated into Greek. In such books there is a kind of orderliness and inclusiveness not found in others. Especially they cultivate the habit of turning often to the grammar. This is needful; in the High School the grammar seems to be following the dictionary and the classical dictionary into oblivion. A student in going through the second part of Dr. Mierow's book will be invited to refer to his grammar; he will hardly be compelled to do so.

Finally, any first Greek composition book, even one avowedly on syntax, might well be stretched to include exercises in the formation of words and word groups, in compounding words, in the classification of verbs, and in the formation of tense stems from verb stems. Students face their Greek with more confidence after exercises of this kind.

UNION COLLEGE.

JOHN IRA BENNETT.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH AND VICINITY

In its meetings this year The Classical Association of Pittsburgh and Vicinity has been placing more emphasis than previously on the use and the reading of Latin and Greek. The President has opened the meetings with short addresses in Latin and the programmes have contained readings from Latin and Greek authors.

At the meeting held on February 15, Professor R. B. English, of Washington and Jefferson College, read and commented on the *Pervigilium Veneris*, Professor T. C. Whitmer, of the Pennsylvania College for Women, read a paper on Greek and Roman Music, and Professor N. E. Henry, of the Peabody High School, Pittsburgh, gave an illustrated talk on Pompeii.

At the fifth meeting of the year, held at Shady Side Academy, Pittsburgh, on March 15, Professor W. H. Martin, of the Pennsylvania College for Women, spoke on Greek and Roman Methods of Mathematical Computation, Mr. Naum Perikleos read selections from the *Antigone* of Sophocles, with Modern Greek pronunciation, and Professor H. S. Scribner, of the University of Pittsburgh, read a paper on The Influence of Homer on Education.

At the sixth and last meeting, on April 26, Principal Maurice Hutton, of the University College, Toronto, will address the Association and invited guests.

H. F. ALLEN, *President*.

Just Published Demosthenes—On the Crown

Edited by MILTON W. HUMPHREYS,
Professor of Greek, University of Virginia
Price, \$1.25

The latest addition to Smyth's Greek Series. The editor has included everything which thirty years' experience has proved needful or useful for students. The introduction, notes, and critical and historical appendix are adequate and scholarly.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
New York Cincinnati Chicago

The Library of every Latin teacher

SHOULD INCLUDE

JOHNSTON'S Private Life of the Romans . . .	\$1.50
cloth 8vo. 304 pages	
" Latin Manuscripts	2.25
cloth 4to. 136 pages	
16 facsimile plates	
" Metrical Licenses of Vergil50
paper 4to. 54 pages	

Copies will be billed "on approval" to teachers and special terms given when the order is for the complete set.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

37 East 28th St., New York

COLLAR AND DANIELL'S FIRST YEAR LATIN

De Lancy School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Just at present Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin is giving me excellent service with a class of older boys whose time for the study of Latin is limited. It is well graded, permitting of rapid advancement without any sacrifice of thoroughness. In my opinion it is well worthy of a place in the Collar and Daniell Series, which is made up of books that have no superiors in their respective fields.

WILLIAM S. BLIGHT, JR., Associate Headmaster

GINN AND COMPANY
70 Fifth Avenue NEW YORK

A SUPERB NEW TEXT

CICERO'S ORATIONS

Edited by
Walter R. Gunnison, Ph.D., Principal, and Walter
S. Harley, A.M., Instructor in Latin,
Erasmus Hall High School.

This is the most complete, most richly illustrated edition of Cicero ever published for school use. Many of its illustrations have never before appeared in a school text. It contains the required orations; a Grammatical Appendix; Prose Composition and Sight Reading Selections. 543 pp. \$1.25.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
231 West 39th Street NEW YORK CITY

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, ETC.,

of The Classical Weekly, published weekly from October 1 to May 31 in each year except weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday,
at New York, N. Y., required by the Act of August 24, 1912.

NAME OF—

POST-OFFICE ADDRESS

Editor, (Professor) Gonzalez Lodge Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York City.
Managing Editor, (Professor) Charles Knapp Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.
Business Manager, (Professor) Charles Knapp Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City.
Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States
Printer, The Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

Owners: (If a corporation, give names and addresses of stockholders holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of stock.)

The Classical Association of the Atlantic States

President: Dr. B. W. Mitchell, Central High School, Phila., Pa.

Secretary-Treasurer: Professor Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City

Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders, holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities:

None such

CHARLES KNAPP, Business Manager

(Signature of editor, publisher, business manager, or owner.)

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of March, 1913.

TIMOTHY RIORDAN,
Notary Public.

[SEAL]